

**Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board**

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 3, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825  
TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2666/ FAX: (916) 263-2668  
www.slpab.ca.gov



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY BOARD  
Providence Speech & Hearing Center  
1301 Providence Avenue  
Orange, CA 92868-3892**

**October 23, 2003  
CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Committee Members Present**

Bruce Gerratt, PhD, Chairperson  
Alison Grimes, AuD

**Committee Members Absent**

Vivian Shannon, MA

**Board Members Present**

Sherry Washington, MA  
Marcia Raggio, PhD  
James Till, PhD  
Rebecca Binge, MA

**Staff Present**

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer  
Candace Raney, Staff Analyst  
Lori Pinson, Staff Analyst  
George Ritter, Staff Counsel

**Guests Present**

Joseph Trunk, Audiologist

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Gerratt called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

**II. Introductions**

Those present introduced themselves.

**III. Appointment of New Committee Member**

Mr. Gerratt requested that Ms. Del Mugnaio explain the need and process for appointing a new committee member to the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Committee.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that because one of the public members serving on the committee has not consistently attended both board and committee meetings, a quorum issue could arise for this committee. As such, Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that a new committee appointment will be made by Chairperson Grimes at the full Board meeting on January 17, 2004. Ms. Raggio volunteered to serve in that capacity.

#### **IV. Continuing Professional Development Course Review**

##### **A. Assess Course Content of Courses, “Depression and Bipolar Disorder,” “How Does Your Engine Run?” & Courses Offered through the Sonoma Developmental Center Medical Education Conference**

Mr. Gerratt introduced the item of discussion before the Committee as a general review of courses that licensees are participating in, and wish to apply to the CPD license renewal requirements.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that practitioners employed by the Sonoma Developmental Center requested that the Board provide guidance on whether the courses included in the meeting materials were acceptable as meeting CPD renewal requirements. She stated that the first course, “Depression and Bipolar Disorder”, offered by the Institute for Natural Resources (INR) was presented by the licensees as being directly relevant to the clients served by the developmental center.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that in the past the Board worked with INR to educate the provider that several of their course offerings were general health courses not specific to the practice of speech-language pathology and therefore should not be advertised as meeting license renewal requirements.

The Committee discussed the content and objectives listed in each of the course outlines provided by both INR and the Sonoma Developmental Center and concluded that the course objectives did not include practice-specific information or recommendations for speech-language pathology assessment or treatment.

Ms. Bingea pointed out that the instructors of the courses were not professionals in the field of speech-language pathology or, for that matter, a closely related profession.

Mr. Gerratt announced the title of each course and asked the Committee for comment as to whether the course should be approved as meeting the CPD license renewal requirements.

Ms. Del Mugnaio pointed out that the course entitled “Sue Who Sue Me? or Practicing in Today’s Medical Legal Climate?” addresses legal issues that pertain to allied health care practitioners and that this particular course appeared to meet the requirements provided in the regulations under “indirect patient/client care.”

The Committee agreed that the course related to legal issues should be approved for CPD credit.

Mr. Gerratt stated that the course “Neuro Modulation, Movement Disorder, Emerging TX Applications” could be beneficial for patients suffering from diseases such as Parkinson’s Disease where speech and language deterioration occurs. However, he stated that he has not read any literature to support that the technique is efficacious for treating speech disorders.

Mr. Till stated that if there were replicated research or peer reviewed journals to support the use of this technique in treating speech disorders, the Board may reconsider its position.

Ms. Del Mugnaio introduced the course “How Does Your Engine Run?” offered by Therapy Works, Inc.

Ms. Washington stated that she is aware that sensory integration (SI) is used in speech-language pathology and is applied to both communication and swallowing.

Mr. Till stated that although a great number of practitioners use SI to improve oral motor movements for treating dysphagia, there is not sufficient literature to support its effectiveness.

Ms. Washington stated that this technique is used with special populations that have difficulty integrating sensory information and that she is aware of an article that supports the use of SI and oral motor exercises.

The Committee agreed that while the use of SI is gaining recognition for treating dysphagia and communication has been utilized as a strategy to elicit communication, the materials presented to the Committee regarding the course “How Does Your Engine Run?” do not provide enough information to determine whether the course addresses SI for speech-language pathology. The Committee requested that Ms. Del Mugnaio review the comprehensive book by Therapy Works, Inc. and reproduce relevant sections for a subsequent review by the Committee at the next meeting.

Ms. Washington offered to assist Ms. Del Mugnaio with reviewing the referenced information.

Mr. Gerratt indicated that the decision regarding the course “How Does Your Engine Run?” offered by Therapy Works, Inc. would be deferred until the January CPD Committee meeting.

**B. Consider Appeal Regarding the Denial for Continuing Professional Development Course Credit:**

- 1. “Defiant Behavior in Children and Adolescents” and “The Addicted Brain”**
- 2. “The Explosive Child”**

Mr. Gerratt introduced the two appeal cases before the Committee and opened the floor for discussion on the first case involving the denial for CPD credit for the courses stated that the first case involving the courses “Defiant Behavior in Children and Adolescents” and “The Addicted Brain.”

Mr. Gerratt stated that the course involved information on treating patients with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and he further read a portion of the letter from the licensee explaining the benefit of the course.

Mr. Gerratt stated that although the subject matter of the course is closely aligned with that of speech-language pathology, he does not believe the course offering is specific to the practice. However, he indicated that in communicating with some of his colleagues about the course, he found them to be interested in the subject matter.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that she has reviewed and approved courses in the past on ADD because the course covered information on the disease and its impact on a person's communication or cognition. She stated that the course in question appeared generic and not specific to managing the speech and language issues that arise with individuals who suffer from the disease.

Ms. Bingea stated that she agreed that the course offers good information for practitioners who encounter patients that present with ADD but she does not believe the course should qualify as "continued learning" for a licensed practitioner.

Ms. Grimes suggested that a mechanism for deciphering whether a course is truly relevant to the licensed practice is to compare the subject matter of the CPD course to a course offered in a graduate level training program and determine whether the CPD course would be an appropriate offering within the graduate curriculum.

The Committee determined that the course "Defiant Behavior in Children and Adolescents" is not practice specific.

Mr. Gerratt introduced the discussion on the course "The Addicted Brain."

The Committee unanimously agreed that the course was not specific to the practice of speech-language pathology but rather provided general information on brain patterns and chemistry.

Mr. Gerratt invited discussion on the second appeal regarding the course "The Explosive Child." He stated that there was little information available about the course in the meeting packets aside from the licensee's own letter of support for the course.

The Committee discussed the course in question, "The Explosive Child", and determined that more information was necessary to issue a decision on the course and that the information should be submitted from the course provider in the form of course handouts and/or the course syllabus.

Ms. Washington suggested that since the Committee is reviewing an increasing number of appeals regarding courses that cover topics of interest for speech-language pathologists but are not deemed practice specific according to the regulatory interpretation, the Board could prepare an informational mailer and provide examples of courses covering similar topics that have been denied and those that have been approved. She stated that the mailer could provide clarity to the definition of direct relevance if the Board were to explain why, for example, one course on ADD is approved because it ties the disease to treatment methods employed by a speech-language pathologist while another is denied because it simply defines the disease.

Mr. Till suggested the terminology “management of a patient” versus “treatment and diagnostic evaluation of a patient” are distinctly different concepts when referring to a course’s direct relevance to a specific practice. He stated that it’s important to be consistent when explaining the CPD provisions to licensees and that staff should explain that CPD courses should be relevant to the practice and should apply the “treatment and diagnostic evaluation of a patient.”

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the suggestions of Ms. Washington and Mr. Till would be incorporated into the denial letters directed to both the licensees and providers.

Mr. Trunk inquired whether courses taken in a profession training program towards an advanced profession degree could be applied to the CPD license renewal requirements.

Ms. Del Mugnaio confirmed that courses taken from accredited universities of higher learning towards an advanced professional degree can be applied to CPD license renewal requirements.

## **V. Review Legislative & Regulatory Proposal to Amend the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Program Components and Review Standards**

Mr. Gerratt requested that Ms. Del Mugnaio summarize the proposal.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the documents in the meeting packets contain draft legislative and regulatory language that reflects the Board’s motion of the July Board meeting to authorize the Board to review individual CPD courses. She stated that after consulting with legal counsel, it was determined that this change must be a statutory change and would require legislation. She suggested that the Department of Consumer Affairs may agree to carry the legislative change in the 2004 departmental omnibus bill that would take effect January 2005.

Ms. Del Mugnaio reviewed each section of the proposal including the administrative process for reviewing course submissions, the limit to the number of CPD hours that licensed audiologists can obtain from courses offered by hearing aid manufacturers or dispensers, and the use of volunteer subject matter experts to review course offerings. She further explained the appropriate legal process for adopting each change.

Mr. Till inquired about the volume of course applications that staff is anticipating once the change is implemented.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that currently the Board has approved approximately 160 CPD providers and that she would estimate that each provider offers at least two courses annually. However, she stated that the staff workload would not significantly increase with the assistance of the volunteer subject matter experts.

The Committee discussed how the training and monitoring of the subject matter experts could be accomplished. They agreed that those who wished to serve in this capacity should appear before the Board for an interview and orientation.

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided the Committee with information from the Maryland Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board regarding available CPD courses in ethics. She stated that she provided the information to follow-up on an issue Ms. Grimes had raised regarding the possibility of requiring a specific number of CPD hours in ethics training in the future.

M/S/C: Grimes/Gerratt

The committee voted to recommend to the Board the courses presented before the Committee for review be denied as applicable to the CPD requirements for license renewal with the exception of the course entitled "Sue Who Sue Me? or Practicing in Today's Medical Legal Climate?" as this course is provided for in the CPD regulations under the indirect client care topics. The Committee further voted to defer a decision on the course "How Does Your Engine Run?" offered by Therapy Works, Inc and the course "The Explosive Child" until the next CPD Committee meeting where further information will be reproduced by Ms. Del Mugnaio and available for review. The committee voted to recommend to the Board the proposed statutory and regulatory changes presented by the executive officer to amend the current CPD program and authorize the Board to review CPD courses, limit the number of CPD hours that licensed audiologists can obtain from courses offered by hearing aid manufacturers or dispensers to 50%, and employ the assistance of volunteer subject-matter experts to review CPD course submissions.

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Grimes adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

---

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer